

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-16, rejecting each. With this paper, claim 1 is canceled, claims 2-16 are amended and no new claims are added.

Rejections under 35 USC §101

At paragraph 4 of the Office action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 USC §101 for being coextensive in scope with claims 1-14 of US Patent No. 6776339. Claim 1 has been deleted, and claims 2-14 have been amended so as to alter their respective scopes. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §101 be withdrawn.

A terminal disclaimer is provided, believed to obviate any future grounds for nonstatutory double patenting rejections.

Rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting

At paragraph 6 of the Office action, claims 15 and 16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. With this paper the above mentioned terminal disclaimer is provided, believed to obviate the grounds for the rejections. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

July 17, 2007

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234

Cust. No.: 004955